

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-14 and 16-20 were examined by the Office, and in the final Office Action of July 27, 2007 all claims are rejected. With this response claims 1, 11, 13-14, 17 and 19 are amended. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

This response is submitted along with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

**Claim Objections**

The objection to claim 1 was previously addressed in the Amendment After Final filed August 27, 2007, and entered as indicated by the Advisory Action of September 12, 2007.

**Claim Rejections Under § 112**

In section 4, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Office asserts that the limitation recited in the independent claims of “using the combined information for selecting a time of access to at least one of the at least two peripheral devices after completion of an initialization of each of said at least two peripheral devices,” is not supported in the originally filed specification. Claim 1 is amended to replace the objected to language, and now recites “using the combined information for determining when at least one of the at least two peripheral devices is ready for operation after completion of an initialization of each of the at least two peripheral devices.” Applicant respectfully submits that the limitations recited in amended claim 1 are described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make or use the invention recited in the claims.

Support for the amendments to claim 1, and the other independent claims, can be found at least from page 17, lines 4-19 and page 18, line 16—page 20, line 11. Lines 4-19 on page 17 specifically state that the timeout value is used by the MMC controller 12 to set a polling frequency, and the MMC controller 12 then carries out a polling with the set polling frequency for determining when the MultiMediaCard 20 is ready for the actual operation. Furthermore, Figure 5 shows that the MMC bus 15 of the mobile station 10 of Figure 1 allows for a plurality of MultiMediaCards to be connected simultaneously to the mobile station, and lines 8-11 of page

20 state that the details of operation in the system of Figure 5 correspond exactly to the details of the operation in the system of Figure 1 described with reference to Figure 4. Figures 1 and 4 describe a system using a single peripheral device.

Therefore, one of skill in the art would understand that as soon as the common timeout value has been determined, the process of Figure 4 may be used individually for each peripheral device based on the determined common timeout value instead of the individual timeout value. Therefore, one of skill in the art would be able to make and use the invention recited in claim 1 based on the description of the invention, because the description specifically describes how information is used to determine when one of at least two peripheral is ready for operation after completion of an initialization. Therefore, the specification discloses to one of skill in the art how to make and use the invention as claimed. As such, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under § 112, first paragraph.

The other independent claims are amended in a manner similar to claim 1, and therefore for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1 are believed to be enabled by the written description. The claims depending from the above mentioned independent claims are also believed to be enabled due to their dependencies.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges that in section 5, on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-14 and 16-20 are indicated to be allowable. Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons discussed above, claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-14 and 16-20 comply with the enablement requirement and are allowable.

Conclusion

The objections and rejections of the Office Action having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal thereof. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiencies required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 15 October 2007

Keith R. Obert

Keith R. Obert  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 58,051

KRO/kas  
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
Telephone: (203) 261-1234  
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676  
USPTO Customer No: 004955